REMARKS

In the Office Action, claims 1-35 were rejected. Claims 1, 12, 19, 22, 24, 28 and 34 are amended. Also, claims 11, 23 and 35 are canceled. Upon entry of the amendments, claims 1-10, 12-22, and 24-34 will be pending in the present patent application. Reconsideration and allowance of all pending claims are requested.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §102

Claims 1, 4, 5, 7-10, 12, 15, 17-22, 24, 26-29, 33 and 34 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent 5,182,432 (hereinafter "Lange"). Claim 1, 12, 19, 22, 24 and 28 are independent. All of the recited claims are believed to be patentable as cited below.

Independent Claims 1, 12, 19, 22, 24 and 28 and Claims Depending Therefrom

The Examiner argued that Lange is believed to teach the claimed lamp assembly comprising a housing and a lamp disposed in the housing, and a lens disposed adjacent to the lamp. Further, the Examiner argued that Lange is believed to teach the claimed lens comprising a conductor adapted to lose electrical conductivity upon occurrence of a crack in the lens. Also, the Examiner argued that Lange is believed to teach the claimed monitoring system coupled to the conductor and configured to detect the loss of electrical continuity in the conductor.

Claims 1, 12, 19, 22 and 28 have been amended to recite in generally similar language, providing a signal to a remote location, where the signal is representative of a status of the condition of the conductor. Applicants submit that, as described in the application, the lighting system condition monitoring system and method of monitoring status of a lighting system advantageously enable the continuous *remote* monitoring of the status of the railroad signal (or other) lens and/or reflector. Furthermore, as any damage to the railroad signal lens and/or reflector may be continuously sensed *remotely*,

maintenance personnel may be dispatched to the railroad crossing only when an anomaly in the railroad signal lens and/or the reflector is sensed, thus greatly reducing the cost of inspection.

Applicants have carefully reviewed Lange and respectfully submit that Lange does not teach a method or system for monitoring status of a lighting system where a signal indicative of the status of the lens and/or reflector is transmitted to a remote location to facilitate remote monitoring of the condition of the lens and/or reflector.

For the reasons summarized hereinabove, Applicants respectfully submit that the reference relied upon by the Examiner cannot anticipate claims 1, 12, 19, 22, 24 and 28. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that independent claims 1, 12, 19, 22, 24 and 28, and claims depending therefrom are allowable and respectfully request the Examiner to reconsider rejection of the claims.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 2, 3, 13, 14, 30 and 31 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Lange. Claims 2-3 are believed to be patentable as they depend from allowable independent claim 1. In addition, claims 13-14 are believed to be patentable as they depend from allowable independent claim 12. Furthermore, claims 30-31 are believed to be patentable as they depend from allowable independent claim 28.

Claims 6, 11, 16, 23 and 35 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Lange in view of U.S. Patent 6,794,882 (hereinafter "Jessup"). Claim 6 is believed to be patentable as it depends from allowable independent claim 1. Additionally claim 16 is believed to be patentable as it depends from allowable independent claim 12.

Furthermore, claims 11, 23 and 35 recite, in generally similar language, providing a signal indicative of a condition of a railroad signal lens and/or reflector to a remote location. While the Examiner acknowledged that Lange does not teach the claimed system for transmitting a signal to a remote location, where the signal is representative of a state of continuity of the conductor, the Examiner relied upon Jessup to teach the claimed system for transmitting a signal to a remote location. More specifically, the Examiner argued that Jessup discloses a system that detects breakage of a vehicle's window by a rupture detector 10, which upon detecting that a rupture has taken place initiates an alarm via an alarm mechanism 32 to notify a driver of the rupture. The Examiner quoted passages at col. 5, lines 10-55 and col. 6, lines 44-58 in support of the rejection.

The relevant cited passage at col. 5, lines 43-55 reads:

> The rupture detector 10 can also include an alarm mechanism 32 in communication with either the electrical measurement mechanism 24 or the control mechanism 26. This alarm mechanism initiates an alarm action based upon the measured or calculated electrical potential, e.g., the calculated resistance, of the conductive member 16. *Any typical alarm action can be initiated, for example a visual alarm (blinking light or graphic display), an audio alarm (through a speaker), or a combination of the two types.* The alarm mechanism 32 also can indicate the extent of the rupture condition, depending upon the movement of the crack across the conductive member 16, resulting in an increasing resistance value. (Emphasis added).

The relevant cited passage at col. 6, lines 44-58 reads:

> The control mechanism 26 and/or the central or multiple dedicated electrical measurement mechanisms 24 are equipped to identify each individual conductive member (44, 48, 52) and calculate the electrical potential (resistance value) for each conductive member (44, 48, 52). In this manner, the vehicle operator receives an indication from the alarm mechanism 32 of the existence and extent of a rupture in each of the transparent members (34, 36, 40) due to the breaking or bridging of the associated conductive member (44, 48, 52). As seen in FIG. 5, during a rupture condition, it typically proves difficult to decipher which ply or

> transparent member (34, 36, 40) has been ruptured or cracked, and the use of multiple conductive members (44, 48, 52) allows the individual to identify the precise source of the failure condition.

The cited passages from Jessup do not support the Examiner's position, however. Applicants respectfully submit that Jessup teaches an alarm mechanism in communication with an electrical measurement mechanism and configured to initiate an alarm action based upon the measured electrical potential of the conductive member. More particularly, Jessup teaches an alarm mechanism that is configured to initiate an alarm action based upon the measured or calculated electrical potential, e.g., calculated resistance, of the conductive member 16. On the contrary, Applicants respectfully submit the present claims recite providing a signal to a remote location where the signal is representative of a state of continuity of the conductor. The alarm provided by Jessup is *within the vehicle itself*, and thus not at a remote location.

For the reasons summarized hereinabove, Applicants respectfully submit that the references relied upon by the Examiner cannot support a *prima facie* case of obviousness.

Conclusion

In view of the remarks and amendments set forth above, Applicants respectfully request allowance of the pending claims. If the Examiner believes that a telephonic interview will help speed this application toward issuance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 1/6/2006

Patrick S. Yoder
Reg. No. 37,479
FLETCHER YODER
P.O. Box 692289
Houston, TX 77269-2289
(281) 970-4545